1. Interpretation: If the neg reads a necessary but insufficient burden, then they must concede the AC contention. To clarify, the neg may not read a standard of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ and read turns to the AC contention.
2. Violation: 1. It’s a NIB 2. He read turns
3. Standard: Reciprocity- the NC and turns give you a 2-1 structural advantage whereas the aff can only win of the AC. Impacts:
   1. detracts from clash- you force me to invest on a layer than you can just kick because I can’t generate offense on it – which is bad for education since clash is the foundation of substantive debate
   2. skews aff strat and time- 1ar time constraints mean the aff is already behind- forcing me spend time on a layer that I can’t generate offense of pointlessly wastes time. Key to fairness 1. Strategy is key to forming a coherent ballot story 2. Time is the basis of argumentation

My interp solves by making the round 1-1 – conceding the aff contention means the round is now solely about who wins the framework debate.

A. If the aff only proves obligation and doesn’t claim presumption or permissibility ground, the neg cannot make multiple independent arguments for moral skepticism, claiming both permissibility and presumption negate without specifying which one skep leads to, and read a counterplan.

[if they do not concede the aff contention] [do not deny the aff permissibility ground] [if they also…]

B. Violation:

C. standards:

1. reciprocity – Multiple skep arguments are multiple NIBs cause a structural skew since beating back your offense is not enough to win the round – at best it would only prove morality exists not that we should affirm. You can choose whether to kick skep in the NR based on my 1ar allocation which proves strategy skew. Key to fairness since equity is the basis of competition. O/w all substantive DAs to my interpretation – they are speculative at best while this is structural. Skep affirms doesn’t solve since a) it’s bad for clash and philosophy engagement – that’s a DA to your education arguments since we have a theory debate; also I allow for better education since you have to justify a skeptical hypothesis in depth instead of reading the same Florida file you’ve already gleaned all the educational benefits from b) quality ground skew – winning skep affirms commits me to condo logic which is horrible ground – you also get to allocate more time to that debate in 2n. *You also say that both permissibility and presumption negate and don’t clarify which one skep actually leads to, meaning you get 6 min to sandbag all your arguments on one or the other layer.*

A. interpretation: neg debaters cannot claim both permissibility and presumption negates – to clarify, you can claim one or the other negates, but not both [if they conclude some form of moral skepticism is true].

B. Violation:

C. Standards:

1. strategy skew – gives you a 2:1 structural advantage since it’s unclear whether skep leads to permissibility or presumption – means if I invest in one layer you can nullify my best responses and go for 6 min of skep and either presumption of permissibility. I have to cover both better in les time – o/w your offense since a) can’t know how much to invest in the AC until I know if you’re going to read skep b) NIBs good offense is not competitive – time skew is a structural issue so even if they’re good in the abstract, not good with skep c) my interp is better for education since we can debate about the implications of a non-coherent statement like the res if skep is true on a philosophical level.

A. interpretation: if the aff does not claim permissibility or presumption affirm, then the neg cannot read [multiple] skep arguments [and claim both permissibility and presumption negate] if they read a CP that they defend unconditionally and claim turns the aff.

[multiple skep arguments bad shell]

1. Shiftiness:

If you advocate a CP unconditionally a win skep, you automatically affirm since the point of that CP is that you will defend it as the correct course of action over the aff unconditionally but if the CP is merely permissible then you are not advocating it at all since you are not claiming it is good or should be done – you have not met the negative burden so you automatically affirm. At worst, ambiguity in definitions is a reason why it is bad. Also if the CP turns the aff it’s uniquely abusive since I have to beat back skep and then win the AC – cross apply the reason why skep affirms doesn’t solve and is un-educational. K2 to fairness since it determines my ability to engage the 1n strategy.